Summary Meeting Notes Meeting #1: CalFed Water Management Development Team September 21, 1999

The following is a summary of the key points, tentative decisions and future work tasks/agenda items that came out of the meeting.

I. Decisions

The following are agreements of the Team:

- We will use sub-groups of the Development Team for particular issues as needed.
- How do we resolve conflicts? Agree on what we can go forward with. We will not agree on all issues. We will identify disagreements and the rationale of each position and pass those on to top-level decision-makers. (Note: A more formalized set of operating procedures to be considered at the next meeting)
- We will rely on conditional agreements through the discussion process; agreements are not final until the final package is developed.
- The Development Team needs to provide clear, concise, timely direction to any sub-groups and to the Coordination Team.
- ☐ Start a sub-group immediately looking at the key items of coordination/integration. Sub-group to meet after (or in some cases before) the full group. Representatives for the group at this point are: Tom Clark, Dan Nelson, Greg Thomas, Tim Quinn, Wayne White, Gary Stern, Gary Bobker
- Coordination Team to bring back "reasonable" asset list including potential net benefit to environment and water supply; constraints such as regulatory and institutional, operational issues, etc. Bring back this list at the next meeting.
- Agree that any solutions need to provide net environmental and water benefit.

Logistics

- ☐ Email and Fax will be primary method of communication.
- Tuesday afternoon meetings every week 1-5 p.m. October 4th (Monday) will be an exception.

III. General Discussion of EWA Assets

The following are some of the points raised during the meeting by individuals. There is not agreement on any of these; they are presented merely to track the discussion and suggest issues for future consideration.

We should not try to resolve the baseline water dispute in this group; we may have to address baseline ultimately. We will all go back and measure against our own ideal of baseline. Many complex issues to be resolved. Concerns over carry over water. ☐ One approach to a biological objective: Protect fish to USFWS and F&G standard given assumptions about differential allocations. ☐ Need to look at water supply benefits and fisheries benefits, need to look hard at the basic assumptions that go into the water account. Gaming exercise was not a policy-setting exercise; rather it tested the flexibility and constraints of the operational system. □ Need to identify assets that provide net benefit to environment and water supply. ☐ This group is not bound by gaming group assumptions. ☐ No time to go through gaming in this group-need to look at specific projects. Need to understand institutional and regulatory constraints of assets. Distinguish between immediate actions and long term goals ☐ Major question to consider: Will the EWA in Phase I modify existing environmental standards, regulations and requirements? Understand funding, timing and regulatory certainty of assets. ☐ Key issue: Is EWA supplemental to or integrated with overall water supply? Measures of success for wildlife/fish are difficult to determine. ☐ Are we talking about re-negotiating existing environment regulations? Two big issues still unresolved: Trinity River Decision and "B2" Decision. ☐ Need agreement from regulatory agencies on fisheries goals/outcomes; this will depend on length of time of agreements and level of assurance. ☐ Asset group needs guidance on parameters. Do not worry as much about individual species, long term goal is habitat ☐ To change regulatory standards requires a process and costs. ☐ Need guidance on how "B2" water might be integrated into operations. Assumptions/Variables/Issues for coordination/integration: Trinity, ESA

"Take," B2 Water, CVPIA, Ecosystem Recovery Goals, Users Made Whole